

A Prolog-based Environment for Reasoning about Programming Languages (Extended abstract)

Roberto Bagnara¹, Patricia M. Hill², and Enea Zaffanella¹

¹ Department of Mathematics, University of Parma, Italy
`{bagnara,zaffanella}@cs.unipr.it`

² School of Computing, University of Leeds, UK
`hill@comp.leeds.ac.uk`

ECLAIR is a Prolog-based prototype system aiming to provide a functionally complete environment for the study, development and evaluation of programming language analysis and implementation tools. In this paper, we sketch the overall structure of the system, outlining the main methodologies and technologies underlying its components. We also discuss the appropriateness of Prolog as the implementation language for the system: besides highlighting its strengths, we also point out a few potential weaknesses, hinting at possible solutions.

Motivation for a flexible language resource. Static program analysis aims to find bugs, verify the absence of errors in software, and ensure the correctness of given optimizations. The standard and most used theoretical framework that lies behind static program analysis is abstract interpretation [8, 9]. This framework, which has been available for more than thirty years, allows us to separate the *abstract domains*, for representing the program’s properties of interest, from the *abstract interpreter* that should mimic the execution of the programs on these domains. As far as the abstract domains are concerned, there is now a good choice of implementations offering a flexible precision/efficiency trade-off. For the abstract interpreter, one non-commercial interpreter that has been used for automatically verifying up to one million lines of C code is *ASTRÉE* [11]; however, *ASTRÉE* is specially targeted at a particular class of programs and program properties, so that widening its scope of application is likely to require significant effort [7]. The interpreters provided by *ECLAIR* system follow the methodology described in [2] which handles most of the problematic features of mainstream, single-threaded languages; the concrete semantics is based on the structured operational semantics extended to allow for infinite computations [10, 13, 15] and the abstract semantics is based on the work of Schmidt [16–18]. The *ECLAIR* system is being designed to have a high degree of flexibility for the following reasons:

- As there is a constantly evolving and, potentially, huge set of programming languages for which analyzers are needed, the prototype interpreter needs to target a variety of language features (including, for example, exception handling, functions and pointers) and have the capability of being extended to incorporate further languages and language features, not yet considered.

Thus, the overall environment has to be designed to provide a uniform interface that delegates the details of the implementation of the run time system to independent components.

- In order to analyze for different types of program properties and error states, the system has to be able to connect with a wide variety of abstract domains. Note that the system’s interface with the abstract domains and their operations must be designed so that it can be coupled with the *relational* domains, that is, those that can capture the relationships between different data objects, as well as, the more efficient but less precise, *non-relational* domains. This flexibility in choice of domains should also be dynamic since, in order to control the precision/efficiency trade-off, the exact domain used may have to be changed during the analysis.
- The aim is to have one system that can be used for teaching, for the development of new technologies and their evaluation and for demonstrating their application. For teaching the basics, we require simple robust systems that support the core language features such as the assignment, conditional and while commands found in all imperative languages. On the other hand, for research and development we need a highly modular and extensible system so that we can plug in new technologies without redefining the whole. Lastly, for demonstration, we need the system to be highly efficient with a well-structured user interface that can verify software that is written in real languages such as C and Java.

From CLAIR to ECLAIR. The ‘Combined Language and Abstract Interpretation Resource’ (CLAIR, <http://www.cs.unipr.it/clair/>) has been initially developed for and used in a teaching context, as a prototype system to help in the study and experimentation with various aspects of programming language implementation. The CLAIR system consists of the following functional components:

- A *parser* module. Lexical and syntactic analyses of the source program are performed according to the concrete grammar of the considered target language, leading to the computation of the corresponding *abstract syntax tree* (AST), i.e., a Prolog term.
- A *static semantics* module. The AST computed in the previous phase is examined so as to compute the static type of each program fragment and perform several context-dependent, well-formedness checks.
- A *dynamic semantics* module. The concrete behavior of a program is specified by adopting the small-step style of the structural operational semantics (SOS) approach [15]. The dynamic configurations of a running instance of the program (i.e., the states of the transition system) are appropriately encoded in suitable Prolog terms, which are then evaluated according to the transition systems’ rules, leading to an interpreter for the language.

The CLAIR system features two simple (though not simplistic) languages: SFL, a functional language; and SIL, a Pascal-like imperative language. By programming in these languages, students are able to see at first hand how the rather

dry rules of the structural operational semantics [15] do in fact deliver a working system capable of executing non-trivial programs, while providing a theoretical framework for proving interesting program properties. These pedagogic experiences hinted at how the same cleanness and flexibility goals that were driving the development of a teaching tool could also be pursued in the much more challenging context of research, leading to the development of ECLAIR (Extended CLAIR), whose overall aim is the analysis of mainstream programming languages. The newly targeted system, whose specification, implementation and evaluation is work in progress, has led to both the design of new functional modules and the restructuring of existing ones:

- The parser module has been extended with several other language instances including, e.g., the Java bytecode language and an almost complete parser for standard C.
- The static semantics module has been instrumented to save the collected type information in a program annotation database, so as to make it readily available to later phases.
- The dynamic semantics module has been refactored so as to distinguish the implementation of the concrete semantics rules (now given in the style of the big-step semantics, relating programs to final configurations) from the so-called *concrete memory structure* component that provides both the concrete memory and some of the control flow management utilities. The concrete memory structure component is partially implemented in the C++ language so as to greatly improve the efficiency of the generated interpreter, which is now able to execute non-toy programs using a reasonable amount of system resources.
- A new *abstract semantics* module has been designed so as to allow for the computation of the abstract semantics of the program. As for the concrete dynamic semantics, a distinction is made between the abstract semantics rules and the specification of the *abstract memory structure* component. This last component is intended as a generic interface for many of the abstract domains and operators that have been proposed for static analysis applications, often implemented in a foreign language such as C++. The abstract semantics is obtained by means of a post-fixpoint computation: the intermediate results are saved, using the program annotation database, as annotations attached to the nodes of the AST; care is taken so as to allow for the specification of context sensitive analyses, whereby different annotations can be attached to the same program fragment depending on the calling context.

Reflections on using Prolog. Prolog has many benefits for the implementation of a system such as ECLAIR, primarily due to the fact that Prolog is based on Horn clauses which are the basis of the formal specification of all the main components. Observe that, for the parser, we have the added advantage that the syntax can be specified by means of the Prolog definite clause grammar rules, which —being a notational variant of Horn clauses— can be executed directly

[14]. For the other three components (static semantics, dynamic semantics and abstract semantics), the formal specification is provided in the form of sequents which map directly to Horn clauses; therefore each component can be regarded as an executable form of its specification.

It follows that, for each of the supported languages, the implementation of the formal static and concrete semantics allows us to perform a comprehensive series of tests so as to evaluate different aspects of its specification and hence help us build confidence that it does accurately match the intended semantics; note that, in the case of a real language such as C, the test results can be compared directly with those obtained using a standard C compiler. Regarding the abstract semantics rules, these also are almost directly translated to Prolog code. However, in this case, these rules are incomplete in the sense that they are parametric on the abstract domain and therefore the code implementing them must be interfaced with specialized libraries that support a variety of abstract domains. For ECLAIR, we use the *Parma Polyhedra Library* so that all the numerical abstractions provided by the PPL such as polyhedra, octagons, intervals and grids can be used by the analyzer [3–5]. Note that, as the PPL provides an almost complete interface to a number of Prolog systems, the ECLAIR to PPL interface can be written entirely in Prolog. We have though had to find appropriate strategies to overcome some inherent weaknesses in Prolog.

- Some components of the tool require great efficiency and are better expressed in an imperative style. This is the case for the concrete memory structure that implements, among other things, destructive updates. As already explained, by partially implementing this structure in the C++ language, we have been able to significantly improve the performance of the interpreter. Also, for the analyzer, it is becoming clear that coding the abstract memory structure in Prolog (using the Prolog interface of the PPL for the numerical abstract domains) is cumbersome. We will thus realize that component mainly in C++ and interface it to the Prolog analyzer using the generic, portable Prolog-C++ interface distributed with the PPL (see [1, 5]). The C++ module of the abstract memory structure will in turn call Prolog for all the symbolic manipulation tasks.
- The lack of types in Prolog makes simple type errors hard to detect. One possible solution is to use optional type declarations such as those provided by the Ciao Prolog system [6]. However, such non-standard annotations, could lead to a loss of portability of the ECLAIR system. A possibility we are considering is the use of the TCLP prescriptive type system [12], the main problem being that it does not currently support SWI-Prolog.
- Well-known deficiencies of Prolog module systems (first of all their flat, not hierarchical nature) make the development of a modular system like ECLAIR more difficult than it ought to be.

Conclusion with ongoing and future work. We have sketched the overall structure of ECLAIR, outlining the main methodologies and technologies underlying its components. We also have justified why we chose Prolog as the imple-

mentation language. Apart from the continuing development of the concrete and abstract interpreters, current work includes investigating several applications for the analyzer, particularly: string cleanness, absence of integer overflows, correctness of array operations, inference of ranking functions and termination analysis. Further interesting extensions of the system are foreseen. In particular, the development of *compiler* modules (including code generation and optimizations): as well as the obvious applications in a teaching context, this will allow to evaluate the usefulness of the information extracted by the abstract semantics module also from the standpoint of optimized compilation.

References

1. R. Bagnara and M. Carro. Foreign language interfaces for Prolog: A terse survey. Quaderno 283, Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Parma, Italy, 2002. Version 1. Available at <http://www.cs.unipr.it/Publications/>.
2. R. Bagnara, P. M. Hill, A. Pescetti, and E. Zaffanella. On the design of generic static analyzers for modern imperative languages. Technical Report [arXiv:cs.PL/0703116](https://arxiv.org/abs/cs.PL/0703116), Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Parma, Italy, 2007. Available from <http://arxiv.org/>.
3. R. Bagnara, P. M. Hill, E. Ricci, and E. Zaffanella. Precise widening operators for convex polyhedra. *Science of Computer Programming*, 58(1–2):28–56, 2005.
4. R. Bagnara, P. M. Hill, and E. Zaffanella. Not necessarily closed convex polyhedra and the double description method. *Formal Aspects of Computing*, 17(2):222–257, 2005.
5. R. Bagnara, P. M. Hill, and E. Zaffanella. The Parma Polyhedra Library: Toward a complete set of numerical abstractions for the analysis and verification of hardware and software systems. Quaderno 457, Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Parma, Italy, 2006. Available at <http://www.cs.unipr.it/Publications/>. Also published as [arXiv:cs.MS/0612085](https://arxiv.org/abs/cs.MS/0612085), available from <http://arxiv.org/>.
6. F. Bueno, D. Cabeza, M. Carro, M. Hermenegildo, P. López-García, and G. Puebla. The Ciao Prolog system. Reference manual. Technical Report CLIP3/97.1, School of Computer Science, Technical University of Madrid (UPM), 1997. Available from <http://www.clip.dia.fi.upm.es/>.
7. P. Cousot. The verification grand challenge and abstract interpretation. In *Verified Software: Theories, Tools, Experiments (VSTTE)*, ETH Zürich, Switzerland, 2005. Position paper.
8. P. Cousot and R. Cousot. Abstract interpretation: A unified lattice model for static analysis of programs by construction or approximation of fixpoints. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*, pages 238–252, New York, 1977. ACM Press.
9. P. Cousot and R. Cousot. Abstract interpretation frameworks. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 2(4):511–547, 1992.
10. P. Cousot and R. Cousot. Inductive definitions, semantics and abstract interpretation. In *Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*, pages 83–94, Albuquerque, New Mexico, USA, 1992. ACM Press.
11. P. Cousot, R. Cousot, J. Feret, L. Mauborgne, A. Miné, D. Monniaux, and X. Rival. The ASTRÉE analyzer. In M. Sagiv, editor, *Programming Languages and Systems*,

- Proceedings of the 14th European Symposium on Programming*, volume 3444 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 21–30, Edinburgh, UK, 2005. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
12. F. Fages and E. Coquery. Typing constraint logic programs. *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming*, 1(6):751–777, 2001.
 13. G. Kahn. Natural semantics. In F.-J. Brandenburg, G. Vidal-Naquet, and M. Wirsing, editors, *Proceedings of the 4th Annual Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science*, volume 247 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 22–39, Passau, Germany, 1987. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
 14. F. C. N. Pereira and D. H. D. Warren. Definite clause grammars for language analysis - a survey of the formalism and a comparison with augmented transition networks. *Artificial Intelligence*, 13(3):231–278, 1980.
 15. G. D. Plotkin. A structural approach to operational semantics. *Journal of Logic and Algebraic Programming*, 60–61:17–139, 2004.
 16. D. A. Schmidt. Natural-semantics-based abstract interpretation (preliminary version). In A. Mycroft, editor, *Static Analysis: Proceedings of the 2nd International Symposium*, volume 983 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 1–18, Glasgow, UK, 1995. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
 17. D. A. Schmidt. Abstract interpretation of small-step semantics. In M. Dam, editor, *Analysis and Verification of Multiple-Agent Languages*, volume 1192 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 76–99. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1997. 5th LOMAPS Workshop Stockholm, Sweden, June 24–26, 1996, Selected Papers.
 18. D. A. Schmidt. Trace-based abstract interpretation of operational semantics. *LISP and Symbolic Computation*, 10(3):237–271, 1998.